

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are pending in the present application. Claims 4 and 10 have been cancelled and claims 1-3, 6 and 9 have been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over Ranking et al. in view of Diepold; claims 3 and 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over Ranking et al. in view of Yokota et al.; and claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over Ranking in view of Diepold in view of Yokota.

Applicants thank the Examiner for discussing this application with Applicants' representative on December 23, 2005. During the discussion, Applicants' representative explained that the magnified image of the present invention differs from the highlighting process shown in Diepold. The Examiner suggested amending the claims to more clearly distinguish how the magnified image is obtained.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 3 and 6 have been amended to further distinguish over Diepold and Ranking. For example, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the calculating section extracts coordinates of an apparent point on the magnified image data, compares the extracted apparent coordinates with corresponding predetermined undistorted coordinates of the ball to thereby calculate an error between the extracted apparent coordinates and the predetermined coordinates, and calculates true coordinates of the points on the magnified image data based on the calculated error. Independent claim 1 also recites that the calculated error increases in accordance with a distance from a center of the magnified image data. Independent claims 3 and 6 include similar features in a varying scope.

These features are supported at least by Figures 3 and 4 and the corresponding description in the specification (see, for example, page 6, lines 9-13).

It is respectfully noted Diepold and Ranking do not teach or suggest these features. For example, Diepold and Ranking do not teach or suggest the calculated error increasing in accordance with a distance from a center of the magnified image data nor how to calculate the true coordinates as claimed. For example, regarding the magnification process mentioned in column 3, lines 58-60 of Ranking et al., it is respectfully noted this is merely a zooming or magnification process for the camera lens 24 to maintain a consistent ball limit size within a video frame produced from the data representative of video images of the golf ball 12. Further, Yokata also does not teach or suggest the features now recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 6.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 3 and 6 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination.

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but to merely show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone David A. Bilodeau at (703) 205-8072 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Application No. 09/986,114
Amendment dated March 24, 2006

Docket No.: 3673-0125P
Page 7 of 7

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant